

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 20-47 are pending, in which claim 10 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 20, 28, 32, 33, 36, 38, 41, and 46 are currently amended, and claim 47 is newly presented. No new matter is introduced.

The Office Action mailed November 12, 2008 rejected claims 1-10 and 20-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious predicated upon *Truetken et al.* (U.S. Pub. 2003/0067887 A1) in view of *Vassilovski et al.* (U.S. Pub. 2003/0012170 A1). Furthermore, the Specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for claim 46.

First, Applicants note that claims 2, 6, 8, 28, 32, 33, and 38 have been amended to merely remedy a few perceived informalities and, in particular instances, to ensure proper antecedent basis and dependency from a parent claim.

Regarding the objection to the Specification, in light of the amendment to independent claim 46, this issue is believed to have been overcome.

In order to reduce issues for potential appeal, independent claims 1, 20, 36, 41, and 46 have been amended. Amended claims 1, 20, and 46 recite, *inter alia*, “a session initiation protocol message transporting one of at least two types of message service **at a single address.**” Claims 36 and 41 now recite, *inter alia*, “a session initiation protocol message transporting one of at least two types of message service **to a single address.**” Applicants submit that *Truetken et al.* and *Vassilovski et al.* are, whether taken alone or in combination, devoid of these features.

More specifically, *Truetken et al.* discloses an application interface 35 that can be utilized by “a calling party when the calling party wishes to initiate a call or a session within a call,” (§ [0025]; FIGS. 3 and 4). In this manner, the “calling party can select a location [of a called party] from an existing drop down list or enter a new location” in a location combo box 67 (§

[0025]; FIG. 3). Further, the “calling party can select [a media type] from a drop list from available helper applications or media” in a media type combo box 69, (*Id.*). In response, system 11 “displays **the address that corresponds to the selected media for the selected called party** in a box 71,” (*Id.*). Thus, when an “SIP invite message is received at the called party client, the called party client displays an invitation dialog box 75 . . . [that] **identifies the calling party and the requested media type**,” (§ [0027]; FIG. 4). If the called party accepts the invitation, “an SIP 200 OK response is sent back to the calling party client and both the calling party and called party clients initiate the session by launching **the appropriate helper application**,” (§ [0027]).

Accordingly, *Truetken et al.* discloses that a particular requested media type will be available at a particular corresponding address and, therefore, a plurality of addresses will be required in order to have correspondence with a plurality of media types. As such, *Truetken et al.* fails to teach, or even remotely suggest, “a session initiation protocol message transporting one of at least two types of message service **at [or to] a single address**.” In fact, the plurality of addresses required by *Truetken et al.* necessarily teaches away from a single address.

Moreover, reference to *Vassilovski et al.* does not cure the deficiencies within *Truetken et al.* Namely, *Vassilovski et al.* discloses ideology whereby a wireless communication device without IP capability can nonetheless communicate with an infrastructure implementing IP, (Abstract). To effect call set-up, “an over-the-air (OTA) origination message from the wireless communication device is received by an infrastructure component, which in turn generates IP-based messages having headers that are extended to include information related to the OTA protocol,” (*Id.*). In this manner, the IP-based message with an extended header is utilized by the infrastructure to set-up the call, (*Id.*). As seen, for example, in FIG. 6, and particularly

described in paragraph [0049], header 100, at best, may be supplemented with, for instance, line 112 that enables header 100 to convey CDMA-specific information, such as MOB_TERM, SCM, PM, ENCRYPTION_SUPPORTED, and PACA_SUPPORTED parameters, which facilitates call set-up. However, there is no teaching, or even a suggestion, within the applied reference that would enable header 100 to transport “one of at least two types of message service **at [or to] a single address.**”

Thus, whether taken alone or in combination, *Truetken et al.* and *Vasslowski et al.* fail to obviate the claimed subject matter. Applicants, therefore, submit that the imposed rejection of claims 1-9 and 20-46 is unsustainable and, hence, should be withdrawn.

New claim 47, as with claims 36 and 41, recites, *inter alia*, “a session initiation protocol message transporting one of at least two types of message service to a single address.” As such, claim 47 is also distinguishable over the applied art.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the objections and rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 519-9952 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,
DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

02-12-09
Date

/Phouphanomketh Ditthavong/
Phouphanomketh Ditthavong
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44658

918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 519-9952
Fax. (703) 519-9958